

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1 and 4 have been amended to present the present invention in a better form for consideration. Claims 2, 3, 4 to 7 were originally presented. Claims 8 to 20 are new claims that are within the disclosure of the present invention and find full support in the originally filed specification. The following claim rejections were noted from the Office Action dated October 18, 2006 and December 11, 2006 and pursuant to each paragraph, presented in the same order, arguments follow.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102**

***Claims 1-4, 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Krenzer (USPN 5,289,815).***

In response to claim 1 rejection, claim 1 has been amended to add the limitation "selecting from the group consisting of star-shaped, saw-blade-shaped and circular saw-shaped dressing wheel components." The support can be found on page 5, line 13 and lines 30 to 33 of the specification.

### **KRENZER DOES NOT ANTICIPATE THE PRESENT INVENTION.**

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). As to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the Krenzer reference does not anticipate the present invention because Krenzer does not teach each and every element of claim 1. Specifically, Krenzer does not teach a dressing wheel component selecting from the group consisting of star-shaped, saw-blade-shaped and circular saw-shaped dressing wheel components. Each of the present star-shaped, saw-

blade-shaped and circular saw-shaped dressing wheel components includes at least one interrupted cutting outer surface. The interrupted cutting surface is further embodied in a cutting wheel with a plurality of tips extending outwardly from the outer surface. As shown in FIG. 1 and FIG. 2 the plurality of tips are arranged continuously one next the other. There are no “flat spaces between the grinding teeth” as the examiner mentioned on page 2 of both of the Office Actions.

Krenzer discloses a dressing tool 30 “with the same pitch and essentially the same tooth profile shape as the mating pinion 14.” See column 4, lines 3 to 5. The pinion 14 is in mesh with a crown gear 2 which has an axis of rotation 4 and radically extending teeth 6. See column 1, lines 16 to 17. The teeth 6 have a top surface 8, flank surfaces 10 and root portion 12. See column 3, lines 11 to 13. Most importantly, there are “flat spaces between the grinding teeth” as the examiner pointed out on page 2 of both Office Actions. Therefore, Krenzer does not teach or disclose a dressing wheel with teeth arranged continuously because all of the figures in Krenzer show otherwise. Thus, Krenzer does not anticipate the present invention.

By way of clarification, Applicant wishes to explain that the flat grinding surfaces are not found between the “teeth”, but rather are found on the additional dressing wheel component, i.e. on the exterior circumference of the “bread” of the “sandwich.” Any suitable flat grinding surfaces is “adjacent to the interrupted cutting outer surface” (from claim 2 as originally presented). By this, it is meant that the outer circumferential surface is flat, not the crotch between the teeth. Applicant is open to any agreeable language that the Office might suggest.

Similarly, the Bocker reference (US Patent Number 3,602,209) also discloses a dressing wheel with “flat spaces between the teeth.” Thus, Bocker does not anticipate the present invention, either.

Since claim 1 is now patentable, the dependent claims 2 to 7 are also patentable and should be allowed.

In claim 4 the terminology “may be” has been amended to “is” to clarify the confusion.

### **New Claims**

Claims 8 to 20 are new and within the disclosure of the present invention. Therefore claims 8 to 20 are patentable. No new matter is introduced.

The support for claims 8, 10 and 17 can be found on page 5, lines 9 to 11 of the specification. The support for claim 9 can be found in the original claim 1 and claim 2. Claim 11 is substantially similar to claim 3. Claims 12 and 18 are substantially the same as claim 4; claims 13 and 19 are substantially the same as claim 6.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the thorough examination, and hopes, that by these amendments and arguments, the subject matter of the present invention is now more clearly stated. The argument provides a closer review of the present invention and gives solid support for an allowance. Consequently, Applicant requests the Examiner’s reconsideration in the instant Application and withdrawal of all grounds of rejection in view of the arguments.

If the Examiner feels that the prosecution of this Application can be expedited by conversation, the Examiner is courteously requested to place a telephone call to Applicant’s attorney at the number listed below.

Application No.: 10/560,521  
Response dated: January 18, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2006

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. For the reasons discussed above, it is believed that this Application is now in an allowable condition such that it is appropriate to hereby respectfully solicit its allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven G. Smarsh  
CARGILL & ASSOCIATES, P.L.L.C. - #25686

/Lynn E. Cargill 31598/  
Lynn E. Cargill  
Registration No. 31,598  
56 Macomb Place  
Mt. Clemens, MI 48043-5636  
Phone: 586-465-6600  
Email: Cargillpatents@usa.net

Date: January 18, 2007

C:\TruTechP-305\011807OAResp